

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/647,357	08/25/2003	Michael Choi	81044321 2228		
36865	7590 08/24/2005	EXAMINER			
	HALL MCCOY RUSS	SAN MARTIN	SAN MARTIN, EDGARDO		
806 S.W. BRC PORTLAND,	OADWAY, SUITE 600 OR 97205	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		2837			

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/6	647,357	CHOI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Exa	miner	Art Unit				
		Edga	ardo San Martin	2837				
	- The MAILING DATE of this commun	ication appears o	on the cover sheet with the	correspondence a	ddress -			
Period fo	• •							
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failur Any n	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 period for reply is specified above, the maximum st e to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months a d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nunication. 0) days, a reply within ta tutory period will apply will, by statute, cause t	n no event, however, may a reply be the statutory minimum of thirty (30) do and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered time m the mailing date of this IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 25 August	2003.					
·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4) 又	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.							
	-							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application	on Papers							
9)□ -	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority	documents have	been received in Applica	tion No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies				l Stage			
	application from the Internatio	•	` ''					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachm==+	(c)							
Attachment 1) Notice	s) of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar	v (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P		Paper No(s)/Mail I	Date				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/25/03</u> .	PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/647,357 Page 2

Art Unit: 2837

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

1. Claims 1 - 11, 13 and 19 - 26 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1 - 11, 13 - 20 and 26, respectively of copending Application No. 10/647,520. This is a <u>provisional</u> double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Even though the claims in the applications are not exact duplicates, they are so close in content that they both describe the same subject matter.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,357

Art Unit: 2837

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9 15, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakase et al. (US 5,970,963).

With respect to claims 1, 13 and 26, Nakase et al. teach a method and noise attenuation device for a vehicle exhaust system, comprising an exhaust pipe having a passageway for receiving exhaust gas pulses from an engine; and a plurality of vanes (Fig.11, Items 11 and 12) extending from an inner surface of the exhaust pipe and spaced apart from one another and disposed upstream of a discontinuity of the exhaust pipe, the vanes configured to reduce turbulence in the exhaust gas pulses flowing past the vanes to reduce noise generated at the exhaust pipe discontinuity (Col.2, Lines 14 – 59 and Col.4, Lines 52 – 62).

With respect to claims 6 and 22, Nakase et al. teach wherein the plurality of vanes form a honeycomb-shaped vane structure in the passageway (Fig.20).

With respect to claims 7, 10 - 12, 14, 23 and 25, Nakase et al. teach the limitations described in the claims (Fig.11; Col.2, Lines 14 - 59).

With respect to claims 9 and 20, Nakase et al. teach wherein the plurality of vanes comprise a wire mesh (Figs.25 and 26, Item 21) in the passageway.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,357

Art Unit: 2837

With respect to claims 15 and 18, Nakase et al. teach the limitations described in the claims (Fig.24).

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 13, 16, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (US 5,113,838).

With respect to claim 1 and 13, Kim teaches a method and noise attenuation device for a vehicle exhaust system, comprising an exhaust pipe having a passageway for receiving exhaust gas pulses from an engine; and a plurality of vanes (Figs.2A and 2B, Item 3') extending from an inner surface of the exhaust pipe and spaced apart from one another and disposed upstream of a discontinuity of the exhaust pipe, the vanes configured to reduce turbulence in the exhaust gas pulses flowing past the vanes to reduce noise generated at the exhaust pipe discontinuity (Fig.1; Col.1, Line 58 – Col.2, Line 56 and Col.3, Line 17 – Col.4, Line 3).

With respect to claim 3, Kim teaches wherein the vanes comprise metal vanes provided by stamped out tabs of the exhaust pipe and wherein a collar (Fig.2B, Item 3) surrounds the exhaust pipe adjacent the vanes.

With respect to claims 5 and 21, Kim teaches further comprising an inner ring disposed in the passageway, the plurality of vanes extending from an inner surface of the exhaust pipe to the inner ring (Fig.2A).

With respect to claims 16 and 17, Kim teaches wherein the discontinuity comprises a coupling location between two sections of the exhaust pipe, or wherein the discontinuity comprises a coupling between an exhaust pipe portion and an exhaust catalyst (Fig.1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 2, 4, 8, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakase et al. (US 5,970,963) or Kim (US 5,113,838).

Nakase et al. and Kim teach the limitations discussed in the previous rejection, but fail to disclose the limitations described in claims 2, 4, 8, 19 and 24.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner considers that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to form the vanes by punching out tabs in a ring of metal. The Examiner considers that the manner in which the vanes are provided would not affect the performance of the Kim attenuator.

Regarding claims 4 and 19, the Examiner considers that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide vanes of a specific material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 8 and 24, the Examiner considers that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide the vanes with any shape or configuration because the applicant does not provide any reason for function criticality of the shape of configuration of the vanes. Actually, the applicant established throughout the disclosure

Art Unit: 2837

that "the number, shape, axial length, inwardly extending distance, thickness, and orientation of the vanes of each embodiment **may be varied** based on desired flow characteristics and noise damping characteristics the devices".

Conclusion

5. The attached hereto PTO Form 892 lists prior art made of record that the Examiner considered it pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edgardo San Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Martin can be reached on (571) 272-2107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,357 Page 7

Art Unit: 2837

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Edgardo San Martín Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2837 Class 181

August 22, 2005